

FTUAM-98-20

IFT-UAM/CSIC-98-25

On Nahm's transformation with twisted boundary conditions

A. González-Arroyo

Departamento de Física Teórica C-XI
and Instituto de Física Teórica C-XVI,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
Cantoblanco, Madrid 28049, SPAIN.

ABSTRACT

Following two different tracks, we arrive at a definition of Nahm's transformation valid for self-dual fields on the 4-dimensional torus T^4 with non-zero twist tensor. The transform is again a self-dual gauge field defined on a new torus $\hat{T}^4$ and with non-zero twist tensor. It preserves the property of being an involution.

PACS: 11.15.-q, 11.15.Ha

Keywords: Nahm transformation, Instanton solutions, Twisted boundary conditions.

1 Introduction

Self-dual $SU(N)$ gauge fields are important objects both for Mathematics and Physics. Polyakov[1] explained their relevance in Quantum Field Theory shortly before the instanton solution appeared[2]. Not too long after, the problem of constructing all self-dual configurations compactified on a sphere was reduced to an algebraic problem in quaternions[3] (the ADHM construction). On physical grounds, the compactification on a sphere amounts to the condition of finite total action. This restriction is, from the physical point of view, unrealistic. Since the action is an extensive quantity, it is more sensible to demand finite action density. For example, in computing the instanton contribution to the path integral one deals with a finite density of instantons. The isolated nature of these solutions, allows one to construct an approximate finite density solution in terms of individual instantons: the dilute gas approximation. However, there is no rigorous justification for diluteness, except for narrow instantons ($\rho \ll \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$). It is, therefore, interesting to consider self-dual configurations with finite action density directly. From the mathematical point of view one could consider self-dual Yang-Mills fields on the torus. These configurations can be looked at as configurations in R^4 which are periodic in space-time. Of course the condition of periodicity is also unphysical, but could provide a starting point around which to construct a more realistic image of the Yang-Mills vacuum. Furthermore, it is a simplification which might allow an analytic solution to be found. Putting Yang-Mills fields on the torus provides an additional richness in the form of new topological sectors. These are the twist sectors introduced by 't Hooft[4], which have an appealing physical interpretation in terms of electric and magnetic flux sectors. Unfortunately, the construction of self-dual gauge fields

on the torus has proved a much harder task. Only a peculiar zero-measure set of these configurations has been analytically constructed[5, 6].

One important tool to study $SU(N)$ self-dual configurations on the torus is the Nahm transform[7]. This is a mapping from self-dual configurations to self-dual configurations, which is an involution. It has the magic property of exchanging the rank of the group with the topological charge. It is remarkable that one can see the ADHM construction as a particular case of the Nahm transform. It would not be surprising if the Nahm transform would hold the key to the construction of self-dual gauge fields on the torus. Actually, it has been successfully used to construct self-dual solutions on $R^3 \times S_1$ [8, 9].

However, the construction of the Nahm transform is based on the solution of the Weyl equation for fields in the fundamental representation of $SU(N)$. These fields are only well defined if the twist sector is trivial. Henceforth, only for this case can one apply the standard construction. It is the purpose of this paper to show how to construct the Nahm transform of self-dual gauge fields which are periodic under a gauge transformation belonging to a non-trivial twist sector. Traditionally several methods have been used to deal with spinor fields in the fundamental representation in the presence of twist. The first one is to go to $U(N)$ by adding a $U(1)$ gauge field which will compensate for the non-trivial twist sector. We will leave this method out of our analysis and will concentrate on the other two approaches. The second one is to add flavour[10], which allows to define boundary conditions which are consistent for the spinor fields. The last one, is to enlarge the torus size by considering more than one cell of the original torus, in a way such that on the new torus the twist sector is trivial(see for example Ref. [11]). In the next two sections we will study the implementation of these two methods. Then in Section 4 we will relate the Nahm transforms obtained from the same

gauge field, but considered as defined in different tori. Finally, the paper is closed with a few concluding remarks.

2 The Nahm transform for non-zero twist

Let us start with $\mathbf{R}^4$ with Euclidean metric. Now, we introduce a rank four lattice of vectors Λ . The generators are the vectors $e^{(\mu)}$ whose components define an invertible matrix $M_{\mu\nu} = e^{(\mu)}_{\nu}$. The quotient $T^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda$ defines a 4-dimensional torus. Now let us consider an $SU(N)$ self-dual gauge field $A_{\mu}(x)$ living in T^4 . This is equivalent to a gauge field on $\mathbf{R}^4$ and satisfying the following periodicity property:

$$A_{\nu}(x + e^{(\mu)}) = [\Omega_{\mu}(x)]A_{\nu}(x) \equiv \Omega_{\mu}(x) A_{\nu}(x) \Omega_{\mu}^{\dagger}(x) + i \Omega_{\mu}(x) \partial_{\nu} \Omega_{\mu}^{\dagger}(x) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where the matrices $\Omega_{\mu}(x)$ belong to $SU(N)$. They must satisfy the following consistency condition:

$$\Omega_{\mu}(x + e^{(\nu)}) \Omega_{\nu}(x) = z_{\mu\nu} \Omega_{\nu}(x + e^{(\mu)}) \Omega_{\mu}(x) \quad . \quad (2)$$

The constants $z_{\mu\nu}$ are elements of $Z(N)$ (the $SU(N)$ center), and, hence, can be written as follows:

$$z_{\mu\nu} = \exp(2\pi i \frac{n_{\mu\nu}}{N}) \quad , \quad (3)$$

where $n_{\mu\nu}$ is an antisymmetric tensor of integers mod N (*the twist tensor*). With an appropriate choice of generators the twist tensor takes the form

$$\mathbf{n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Xi \\ -\Xi & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (4)$$

where $\Xi = \text{diag}(q_1, q_2)$ and q_1, q_2 are positive integers ($1 \leq q_i \leq N$).

We may now introduce the following family of $U(N)$ self-dual gauge fields on the torus:

$$A_\mu^z(x) = A_\mu(x) + 2\pi z_\mu \mathbf{I} . \quad (5)$$

The arbitrary real numbers z_μ can be arranged into a four-vector z , and $\mathbf{I}$ is the $N \times N$ identity matrix. The field strength, and the topological charge Q are independent of z .

Let us now consider an orthonormal basis of the space of solutions of the Weyl equation in the fundamental representation with $A_\mu^z(x)$ as background field:

$$\overline{D}^z \Psi^\alpha(x, z) = 0 . \quad (6)$$

The positive chirality Weyl operator is given by $\overline{D}^z \equiv D_\mu^z \bar{\sigma}_\mu$ ($D_\mu^z = \partial_\mu - i A_\mu^z(x)$), where $\bar{\sigma}_\mu = (\mathbf{I}_{2 \times 2}, i \vec{\sigma})$ and σ_i are the Pauli matrices.

Now let $e(n)$ denote an element of the lattice Λ :

$$e(n) = n_\mu e^{(\mu)} , \quad (7)$$

where n is a vector of integers. To this element we may associate an $SU(N)$ matrix $\Omega_n(x)$. These matrices can be obtained by composing in a given order the matrices $\Omega_\mu(x)$ n_μ times. Changing the order of multiplications could change the $\Omega_n(x)$ by multiplication by an element of the center. Once a choice is made, we can write:

$$A_\nu(x + e(n)) = [\Omega_n(x)] A_\nu(x) . \quad (8)$$

Let us first assume that the twist is trivial $n_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Then, by virtue of the Atiyah-Singer index theorem [12] and the assumption that there are no negative chirality zero-modes, one can find Q orthonormal solutions of the Weyl equation (6) $\Psi^\alpha(x, z)$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, Q$) satisfying:

$$\Psi^\alpha(x + e(n), z) = \Omega_n(x) \Psi^\alpha(x, z) \quad (9)$$

The previous equation is consistent because the $\Omega_n(x)$ commute among themselves. From these solutions, we can construct the Nahm transform of $A_\nu(x)$ as follows:

$$(\widehat{A}_\mu(z))_{\alpha\beta} = \imath \int_{T^4} d^4x \, \Psi^{\dagger\alpha}(x, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_\mu} \Psi^\beta(x, z) \quad (10)$$

It can be shown, that $\widehat{A}_\mu(z)$ is an $SU(Q)$ self-dual gauge field with topological charge N (See Ref. [13] for a proof of these and other properties of the Nahm transform). Now, let us investigate the periodicity properties of $\widehat{A}_\mu(z)$. For that we notice that $\exp(-2\pi\imath \tilde{z}_\mu x_\mu) \Psi^\alpha(x, z + \tilde{z})$ satisfies the same equation than $\Psi^\alpha(x, z)$. The boundary conditions are, however, different in general. In order to satisfy Eq. 9, one must have that $\tilde{z}_\mu e_\mu^{(\nu)} \in \mathbf{Z}$. This is the condition that defines the dual lattice $\tilde{\Lambda}$. The basis dual to $\{e^{(\nu)}\}$ is given by $\{\tilde{e}^{(\nu)}\}$ satisfying:

$$\tilde{e}_\rho^{(\mu)} e_\rho^{(\nu)} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \quad . \quad (11)$$

Now, since $\Psi^\alpha(x, z)$ is a basis of the space of solutions with boundary conditions (9), we must have:

$$\Psi^\alpha(x, z + \tilde{e}^{(\mu)}) = \Psi^\beta(x, z) (\widehat{\Omega}_\mu^\dagger(z))_{\beta\alpha} \exp(2\pi\imath \tilde{e}_\rho^{(\mu)} x_\rho) \quad . \quad (12)$$

Then one sees that $\widehat{A}_\nu(z)$ satisfy boundary conditions similar to those of equation (1) with $\Omega_\mu(x)$ replaced by $\widehat{\Omega}_\mu(z)$. In summary, the Nahm transformed field lives in the dual torus $\tilde{T}^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\tilde{\Lambda}$.

Let us go back to the general twist case. The previous procedure fails because Eq. (9) becomes inconsistent for non-trivial twist. The strategy that we will put forward is the following. Consider a sublattice Λ' of Λ . The sublattice is chosen in such a way that for all $e(n) \in \Lambda'$ the corresponding $\Omega_n(x)$ commute (Actually the $\Omega_n(x)$ must define a representation of Λ'). We will impose Eq. (9) only in Λ' . This is equivalent to considering the fields as

living in a wider torus $T'^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda'$. In this case the Nahm transform can be constructed in the same way as described before, and lives in $\tilde{T}'^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\tilde{\Lambda}'$. The rank of the Nahm transformed field is now $\hat{N} = Q |\Lambda/\Lambda'|$, where $|\Lambda/\Lambda'|$ is the order of the quotient group of the two lattices. Henceforth, the basis of the space of solutions is $\Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z)$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = 1, \dots, \hat{N}$.

We want now to explore the consequences of the original stronger periodicity condition for the fields. For any $n \in \mathbf{Z}^4$ we can define:

$$\Psi^{(n)\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z) = \Omega_n^\dagger(x) \Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}(x + e(n), z) \quad . \quad (13)$$

If $e(n) \in \Lambda'$, the boundary conditions imply that the $\Psi^{(n)\tilde{\alpha}}$ coincide with $\Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}$. Notice, however, that for any n the previous functions are solutions of the Weyl equation (6). The problem is that, if the twist tensor is non-zero, the previous functions satisfy boundary conditions which differ by multiplication by an element of the center from those of $\Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z)$. However, remember that the same situation took place whenever we displaced z by a vector not belonging to the dual lattice and multiplied it by a corresponding phase. Henceforth, combining both operations, we arrive at our most important result, summarized in the following formulas:

$$\Psi^{(n)\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z + \Delta) \exp(-2\pi i \Delta_\mu x_\mu) = \Psi^{\tilde{\beta}}(x, z) (\hat{\Omega}_{n\Delta}^\dagger(z))_{\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\alpha}} \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} n_{\mu\nu} n_\nu m_\mu - \Delta_\mu e(m)_\mu \in \mathbf{Z} \quad \text{for } e(m) \in \Lambda' \quad . \quad (15)$$

The second equation (15) is the necessary and sufficient condition for the left hand side of Eq. (14) to satisfy the same boundary conditions as $\Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}(x, n)$. The first equation then expresses the fact that it can be written as a linear combination of the basis of the space of solutions. One can see from (13) that the functions $\Psi^{(n)\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z)$ are orthonormal irrespective of n , and hence the $\hat{\Omega}(z)$ are unitary. Then, one can conclude that for any Δ such that there

exists an n satisfying Eq. (15) we have:

$$\widehat{A}_\nu(z + \Delta) = [\widehat{\Omega}_{n\Delta}(z)] \widehat{A}_\nu(z) . \quad (16)$$

This formula is similar to Eq. (1), and is the main formula we were looking for. For Δ belonging to $\widetilde{\Lambda}'$, it amounts to what was known previously. But this formula makes the periodicity valid for a larger lattice $\widehat{\Lambda}$. We must now study the consistency conditions that follow from equation (14). If we consider two sets (n, Δ) and (n', Δ') satisfying Eq. (15), we can deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_{n\Delta}(z + \Delta') \widehat{\Omega}_{n'\Delta'}(z) = \\ \exp\left\{\frac{2\pi i}{N} n_{\mu\nu} n_\mu n'_\nu + 2\pi i (\Delta_\rho e(n')_\rho - \Delta'_\rho e(n)_\rho)\right\} \widehat{\Omega}_{n'\Delta'}(z + \Delta) \widehat{\Omega}_{n\Delta}(z) . \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

This condition is the counterpart of Eq. (2) for the Nahm transform.

Now, all we need is to straighten up the conditions implied by Eqs. (14-17). Let us stick to the form Eq. (4). Then, if $q_i \neq 0$ we can form the integers $p_i = N / \gcd(N, q_i)$. The case $q_i = 0$ can be treated in the same fashion by setting $q_i = N$, $p_i = 1$. The lattice Λ' is the one spanned by the vectors $\{e^{(0)}, e^{(1)}, p_1 e^{(2)}, p_2 e^{(3)}\}$. The elements of Λ/Λ' can be labeled by two integers $n_2 = 0, \dots, (p_1 - 1)$ and $n_3 = 0, \dots, (p_2 - 1)$. Then an arbitrary element¹ of the lattice $\widehat{\Lambda}$ is given by $\Delta = \hat{e}^{(\mu)} k_\mu$ ($k_\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$). The generators are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}^{(0)} &= \tilde{e}^{(0)} / p_1 \\ \hat{e}^{(1)} &= \tilde{e}^{(1)} / p_2 \\ \hat{e}^{(2)} &= \tilde{e}^{(2)} / p_1 \\ \hat{e}^{(3)} &= \tilde{e}^{(3)} / p_2 \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

¹The corresponding element of Λ/Λ' is given by $n_2 = s_1 k_0 \bmod p_1$; $n_3 = s_2 k_1 \bmod p_2$, with s_i defined after Eq. (19).

From Eq. (17) one can compute the twist matrix $\hat{n}_{\mu\nu}$ associated to the Nahm transform:

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\Xi} \\ -\hat{\Xi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } \hat{\Xi} = \text{diag}((p_1 - s_1)p_2Q, (p_2 - s_2)p_1Q) \quad , \quad (19)$$

where s_i is an integer ($0 \leq s_i \leq (p_i - 1)$) satisfying $s_i q_i = \text{gcd}(q_i, N) \bmod N$. We have taken the rank of the Nahm transform $\hat{N}$ to be $Q p_1 p_2$. Taking into account that the topological charge Q has the form $l - \frac{q_1 q_2}{N}$ with l an integer (see for example Ref. [14]) one can easily show that the $\hat{n}_{\mu\nu}$ are integers.

To conclude this section, we mention that if we apply Nahm's transformation to the Nahm transform, we obtain back the original gauge field with twist in T^4 . If we label with a $\wedge$ all quantities referring to the Nahm transform, one can derive the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N} &= Q p_1 p_2 & \hat{Q} &= \frac{N}{p_1 p_2} \\ \hat{p}_i &= p_i & \hat{s}_i &= p_i - \frac{q_i}{\text{gcd}(N, q_i)} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

With these relations it is not hard to show that $\hat{\hat{\Lambda}} = \Lambda$, and that after applying the Nahm transform twice we recover the original set of parameters. It is also easy to show that the Nahm transform of a gauge field configuration with non-orthogonal twist ($\frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}n_{\mu\nu}n_{\rho\sigma} \neq 0 \bmod N$) has also non-orthogonal twist.

3 Adding flavour

Now let us pursue a different strategy. What we will do is to map our $SU(N)$ gauge field into an $SU(N N_0)$ one as follows:

$$A_\mu(x) \longrightarrow A_\mu(x) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N_0 \times N_0} \quad . \quad (21)$$

The advantage of this construction is that one can choose twist matrices in $SU(N N_0)$ which belong to the trivial twist sector:

$$\Omega_\mu(x) \longrightarrow \Omega_\mu(x) \otimes \Gamma_\mu \quad , \quad (22)$$

where Γ_μ are constant $SU(N_0)$ twist matrices (in some cases we will need to relax them to being in $U(N_0)$) satisfying:

$$\Gamma_\nu \Gamma_\mu = z_{\mu\nu} \Gamma_\mu \Gamma_\nu \quad . \quad (23)$$

The previous condition is required to cancel the twist of the Ω_μ . The solutions are the so-called *twist eaters*. These exist provided N_0 is an integer multiple of $p_1 p_2$ (see Ref. [14]-[15] and references therein for the existence and properties of twist eaters). Let us take precisely $N_0 = p_1 p_2$, where the solution is irreducible. Then we have produced an $SU(p_1 p_2 N)$ self-dual gauge field having topological charge $Q p_1 p_2$ and transforming under translations by elements of Λ with twist matrices belonging to the trivial twist sector. Hence, we are in the conditions under which we can apply the standard Nahm transform procedure, thus generating an $SU(Q p_1 p_2)$ self-dual gauge field having topological charge $N p_1 p_2$ and living in $\tilde{T}^4$. This Nahm transform coincides with the one constructed in the last section with a different procedure.

Before proving this, we will show that the new Nahm transform field is periodic (modulo gauge transformations) not only in the torus $\tilde{T}^4$, but in the finer one $\hat{T}^4$. The proof is as follows. Let us consider a basis of the space of solutions of the Weyl equation with the appropriate boundary conditions $\Phi^{i\alpha}(x, z)$. The index i is the flavour index ($i = 1, \dots, N_0$), and the index α runs over the $Q p_1 p_2$ linearly independent solutions. For every i and α the previous fields satisfy the Weyl equation (6). Furthermore, they satisfy the following boundary condition:

$$\Phi^{i\alpha}(x + e(n), z) = \Omega_n(x) \Gamma_n^{ij} \Phi^{j\alpha}(x, z) \quad . \quad (24)$$

The constant unitary $N_0 \times N_0$ matrices Γ_n are constructed in the same way as the $\Omega_n(x)$. The product $\Omega_n(x) \Gamma_n$ does not depend on the product sequence taken to construct them. Now, let us show the required periodicity in $\widehat{T}^4$, by constructing the following functions:

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{i\alpha}(x, z + \Delta) = \exp(2\pi i \Delta_\mu x_\mu) S_\Delta^{ij} \Phi^{j\alpha}(x, z) \quad , \quad (25)$$

where the S_Δ are constant unitary matrices. The functions $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfy the Weyl equation for $z + \Delta$. Furthermore, they satisfy the boundary conditions (24) provided:

$$S_\Delta \Gamma_n S_\Delta^\dagger = \exp(-2\pi i \Delta_\mu e(n)_\mu) \Gamma_n \quad . \quad (26)$$

The set of values of Δ for which there exist a constant unitary S_Δ satisfying the previous equation defines a new lattice, which obviously contains $\tilde{\Lambda}$. We have now to show that it is precisely $\widehat{\Lambda}$.

Let us write:

$$S_\Delta = \Gamma_0^{l_0} \Gamma_1^{l_1} \Gamma_2^{l_2} \Gamma_3^{l_3} \quad , \quad (27)$$

with l_i some integers depending on Δ . The condition (26) now reads:

$$\frac{n_{\mu\nu} n_\mu l_\nu}{N} + \Delta_\mu e(n)_\mu \in \mathbf{Z} \quad . \quad (28)$$

This condition must hold for all values of the integers n_μ . It is easy to see that this has a solution if and only if $\Delta \in \widehat{\Lambda}$. Actually Eq. (28) represents a much cleaner characterization of $\widehat{\Lambda}$ than Eq. (15). The Nahm transform defined in this way coincides both in the rank and in the defining torus with the one constructed in the previous section. In the following paragraph we will prove that the two procedures do indeed give the same Nahm transformed field.

For that purpose, we take the explicit form of the twist tensor (4) and make a particular choice of the Γ_μ matrices. Γ_0 and Γ_1 can be chosen diagonal, while the other two are necessarily non diagonal. However, $\Gamma_2^{p_1}$ and $\Gamma_3^{p_2}$

are also diagonal. It is also possible, if we take the matrices to be in $U(N_0)$ rather than $SU(N_0)$, to choose these 4 diagonal matrices such that the 1, 1 component is 1 (see Ref. [14]-[15] and references therein for a proof of these facts). The advantage of this choice is that now the functions $\Phi^{1\alpha}(x, z)$ satisfy the same conditions as the functions $\Psi^{\tilde{\alpha}}(x, z)$ introduced in the previous chapter. Clearly the former can be written as linear combinations of the latter or vice versa. Notice that the difference between both constructions is that in one of them (Φ) the functions have a flavour index taking $N_0 = p_1 p_2$ values, in the other case (Ψ) the functions are taken to live in a larger torus T'^4 rather than T_4 . We will now see how both points are related. Translating $\Phi^{1\alpha}(x, z)$ we get:

$$\Phi^{1\alpha}(x + n_2 e^{(2)} + n_3 e^{(3)}, z) = \Omega_n(x) \Gamma_n^{1j} \Phi^{j\alpha}(x, z) \quad , \quad (29)$$

where $n = (0, 0, n_2, n_3)$. Now, it can be seen that Γ_n^{1j} is only non-zero for one particular j . This establishes a one to one correspondence between flavour components and elements $e(n) \in \Lambda/\Lambda'$. Even more the Γ_n^{1j} can be chosen to be 1 (with Γ in $U(N_0)$). These relations serve to fix normalizations, and with an appropriate choice of basis in both cases one can obtain the following relation:

$$\Phi^{j\alpha}(x, z) = \Omega_{-n}(x) \Psi^\alpha(x + n_2 e^{(2)} + n_3 e^{(3)}, z) \quad (30)$$

which establishes the connection between the formalism of the previous section and the one of this section. One can easily see that the Nahm transformed fields constructed with both methods coincide. In the method of last section one has no flavour index, but the integral necessary to construct the Nahm transform is in T'^4 which is a torus $p_1 p_2$ times larger than T^4 . In summary, replicas can be looked at as flavours.

4 Replicas without twist

We will now apply the formalism of section 2 to understand what happens when we replicate the torus in the absence of twist. We start with the self-dual $SU(N)$ gauge field $A_\mu(x)$ defined on the torus $T^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda$. The topological charge is Q . Now we can construct the Nahm transform, which is an $SU(Q)$ self-dual gauge field defined in $\tilde{T}^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\tilde{\Lambda}$. On the other hand, we might look at $A_\mu(x)$ as a gauge field defined on the larger torus $T'^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda'$, where Λ' is a sublattice of Λ . Applying the Nahm transform in this case gives an $SU(Q|\Lambda/\Lambda'|)$ gauge field living in the dual torus $\tilde{T}'^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\tilde{\Lambda}'$. The question that we want to answer is what is the relation between both Nahm transforms.

Without loss of generality we can restrict ourselves to the case in which we replicate the torus in one direction. By repeated application of this situation we can deal with the general case. Let $e^{(\mu)}$ be the generators of Λ . The lattice Λ' has the same generators except for $e'^{(0)} = L e^{(0)}$ where $L = |\Lambda/\Lambda'|$ is a positive integer. For the dual tori we have $\tilde{e}'^{(0)} = \frac{1}{L} \tilde{e}^{(0)}$. Now consider the solutions of the Weyl equation in T^4 . There are Q orthonormal linearly independent solutions $\Psi^\alpha(x, z)$ satisfying the boundary conditions Eq. (9). With them we can construct the Nahm transform as usual. Now let us consider the following functions:

$$\Psi^{\alpha k}(x, z) = \Psi^\alpha(x, z + \frac{k}{L} \tilde{e}^{(0)}) \exp(-2\pi i x_\mu \tilde{e}_\mu^{(0)} \frac{k}{L}) \quad , \quad (31)$$

where k is an integer ranging from 0 to $L - 1$. They are all solutions of the Weyl equation. Let us see how these functions behave under translations along $e^{(0)}$. We have

$$\Psi^{\alpha k}(x + l e^{(0)}, z) = \exp(-2\pi i \frac{kl}{L}) \Omega_{n_l}(x) \Psi^{\alpha k}(x, z) \quad , \quad (32)$$

where $n_l = (l, 0, 0, 0)$. Notice that, although only for $k = 0$ the boundary conditions on T^4 are satisfied, they all satisfy the right boundary conditions on T'^4 , i.e. for $l = L$. Since there are LQ different functions, they constitute a basis of the space of solutions provided they are linearly independent. We will show that indeed they are all mutually orthogonal in T'^4 . The proof goes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T'^4} dx \Psi^{\dagger\alpha'k'}(x, z) \Psi^{\alpha k}(x, z) = \\ \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_{T^4} dx \Psi^{\dagger\alpha'k'}(x + l e^{(0)}, z) \Psi^{\alpha k}(x + l e^{(0)}, z) = \\ \left(\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \exp(2\pi i \frac{l(k-k')}{L}) \right) \int_{T^4} dx \Psi^{\dagger\alpha'k'}(x, z) \Psi^{\alpha k}(x, z) = \\ L \delta_{kk'} \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

In the last identity we used the orthogonality of the $\Psi^\alpha(x, z)$ for arbitrary z .

Dividing the functions $\Psi^{\alpha k}(x, z)$ by $\sqrt{L}$, we have the necessary orthonormal basis of the space of solutions that we need to construct the Nahm transform in T'^4 . Applying the definition of the Nahm transform, and after similar manipulations as in Eq. (33) we arrive at:

$$\left(\widehat{A}(z) \right)_{(\alpha k)(\alpha' k')} = \delta_{kk'} \left(\widehat{A}(z + \frac{k}{L} \tilde{e}^{(0)}) \right)_{\alpha\alpha'}, \quad (34)$$

where the left hand side is the Nahm transform defined in T'^4 and it is expressed in terms of the Nahm transform in T^4 . It is clear from our formulas that the former is reducible and invariant (modulo gauge transformations) under translation of z by $\frac{1}{L} \tilde{e}^{(0)}$.

5 Concluding remarks

Let us first summarize our results. In the previous sections, we have explained how to define the Nahm transform of an $SU(N)$ self-dual gauge field living

in the torus $T^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda$ with twist tensor $\mathbf{n}$. This is again an $SU(Q)$ self-dual gauge field defined on the torus $\widehat{T}^4 = \mathbf{R}^4/\widehat{\Lambda}$ with twist tensor $\widehat{\mathbf{n}}$. The explicit expression of $\widehat{\Lambda}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{n}}$ are given in Eqs. (18),(28),(19) for a basis of Λ such that $\mathbf{n}$ has the canonical form (4). If we want to give the relations in an arbitrary basis we have to write $\frac{\mathbf{n}}{N} = QR^{-1} + \Sigma$, where Q , Σ and R are integer matrices, and the first two are antisymmetric (R is positive definite). In the canonical basis the matrix R is $\text{diag}(p_1, p_2, p_1, p_2)$. If we change from the canonical basis to other by means of the integer unit determinant matrix U , then $R \longrightarrow U^{-t}RU^t$, where U^t is the transpose of U and U^{-t} the inverse transpose. We also demand the existence of another integer matrix $\widehat{Q}$ such that $\widehat{Q}Q = -\mathbf{I} + \Sigma''R$, where Σ'' is an arbitrary integer matrix. Given this notation we can summarize the Nahm transformed expressions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{M} &= R^{-1}\widetilde{M} \\ \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{n}}}{\widehat{N}} &= \widehat{Q}R^{-t} + \Sigma'\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

where $(\widehat{M})_{\mu\nu} = \widehat{e}_\nu^{(\mu)}$ is the matrix giving the coordinates of the basis of $\widehat{\Lambda}$, and Σ' in an arbitrary integer matrix.

The formalism reduces to the standard one in the absence of twist. One has simply to set $R = \mathbf{I}$, or $q_i = N$; $p_i = 1$ in the appropriate formulas.

There are some applications of the present formalism that one can think of. It is possible, for example, to extend the results of van Baal on the Nahm transform of constant field strength self-dual solutions [16] to the case of non-zero twist. There are other questions which can be investigated with our formulas, such as the occurrence of fixed points of the Nahm transform. In a previous paper [11] we applied our numerical approach to the Nahm transform, to a case which turned out to be a good candidate for a fixed

point². Indeed, the expressions presented here are in agreement with the conclusions of that paper. Conversely, the numerical results of that paper can serve as an explicit case where one can see the present formalism at work.

Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank Pierre van Baal, Margarita Garcia Perez and Carlos Pena for useful conversations on the subject. Special thanks go for Pierre van Baal for useful suggestions and a critical reading of the manuscript.

² the word fixed point has to be understood modulo an orthogonal transformation in space-time

References

- [1] A.M. Polyakov, *Phys. Lett.* 59B (1975) 82.
- [2] A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz and Yu. S. Tyupkin. *Phys. Lett.* 59B (1975) 85.
- [3] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin, V. G. Drinfeld and Y. I. Manin. *Phys. Lett.* 65A (1978) 185.
- [4] G. 't Hooft. *Nucl. Phys.* B153 (1979) 141.
- [5] G. 't Hooft. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 81 (1981) 267.
- [6] P. van Baal. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 94 (1984) 397.
- [7] W. Nahm. *Phys. Lett.* 90B (1980) 413.
E. Corrigan and P. Goddard. *Ann. Phys.* 154 (1984) 253.
- [8] Th. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, *Phys. Lett.* 428B (1998) 268;
Nucl. Phys. B533 (1998) 627; *Phys. Lett.* 435B (1998) 389.
- [9] K. Lee and C. Lu, *Phys. Rev.* D58 (1998) 025011.
- [10] E. Cohen and C. Gomez. *Nucl. Phys.* B223 (1983) 183.
- [11] A. González-Arroyo and C. Pena. *Jour. of High Energy Phys.* 09 (1998) 013.
- [12] M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer. *Ann. Math.* 87 (1968) 485 and 546;
Ann. Math. 93 (1971) 119 and 139.
- [13] P. J. Braam and P. van Baal. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 122 (1989) 267.

- [14] A. González-Arroyo. Proceedings of the 1997 Peñíscola Advanced School in Non-Perturbative Quantum Physics, World Scientific (1998); hep-th/9807108.
- [15] P. van Baal and B. van Geemen *J. Math. Phys.* 27 (1986) 455-457;
D. R. Lebedev and M. I. Polikarpov. *Nucl. Phys.* B269 (1986) 285.
- [16] P. van Baal, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* 49 (1996) 238.